



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/360,951 | 07/27/1999 | ROBERT W. GREER IV | 908.199 | 4898 |

7590

10/03/2002

SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20037-3213

EXAMINER

MERLINO, AMANDA H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2877

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/360,951

Applicant(s)

GREER IV, ROBERT W.

Examiner

Amanda H Merlino

Art Unit

2877

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 June 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-12 and 25-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-12 and 25-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 14 6) ☐ Other:

Claims 1-12 and 25-27 are pending. Claims 13-24 and 28-31 are canceled. The latest response filed 6/21/02 has been entered. If any previous rejection(s) or objection(s) is/are not repeated below it has been withdrawn by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-12 and 25-27 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petisce (5,074,643) in view of Szum et al (6,298,189).

Petisce teach of a telecommunication element comprising an optical fiber (20) having a core and a cladding and radiation cured polymeric coating having an identifying color wherein the identifying color in the polymeric coating is provided by at least one chromophore molecule wherein the coating includes a diluent and photo-initiator. Petisce further teach of a plurality optical fiber optical fiber in an array to form a fiber ribbon.

Petisce lacks the teaching of the molecule being covalently bonded to the coating.

Szum et al teach of molecules being covalently bonded the coating.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to covalently bond the coating with the chromophore molecule as taught by Szum et al for the specific reasons taught by Szum et al which is to prevent the

molecule to be extracted or volatilized from the cured coating without breaking the covalent bonds (col 23).

With reference to claims 7, 10, and 12, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the optimum weight percents since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 6/21/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that "Szum et al merely teaches a slip agent coupled to a composite oligomer which is covalently linked within a radiation curable coating. Thus, Szum et al related to a slip agent, not a coloring agent, much less a chromophore molecule, as claimed in the present invention." Applicant further argues that "one skilled in the art would not have been motivated to combine the teachings of Szum et al with respect to a slip agent with the teachings of Petisce with respect to a chromophore molecule. Examiner agrees with applicant that Szum et al does not teach of covalently linking a chromophore molecule with a coating. However, examiner believes that one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to use the teachings of Szum et al of covalently bonding a coating to a "molecule" and by taking into consideration the benefits of covalently bonding as stated in the above rejection, covalently linked the chromophore molecules to the coating of Petisce. Furthermore, examiner directs

applicant to US patent 6,001,936 which applicant cited in IDS submitted 6/21/02 wherein a chromophore molecule is covalently linked with a coating,

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Szum (6,240,230) also teach of covalently bonding the molecule with the cured coating

Papers related to the application may be submitted to Group 2800 by Fax transmission. Papers should be faxed to Group 2800 via the PTO Fax Machine located in Crystal Plaza 4. The form of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). The CP4 Fax Machine number is:

703-308-7722

If the applicant wishes to send a Fax dealing with a Proposed Amendment for discussion for a phone interview then the fax should:

- 1) Contain either the statement "DRAFT" or "PROPOSED AMENDMENT" on the Fax Cover Sheet; and
- 2) Should be unsigned by the attorney or agent.

Art Unit: 2877

This will ensure that it will not be entered into the case and will be forwarded to the examiner as quickly as possible.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to *Examiner Amanda H. Merlino* whose telephone number is (703) 305-3488. The examiner can be reached on Mondays and Thursdays only.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-0956.

Amanda H. Merlino *ahm*
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2877
September 30, 2002/ahm

FA 2/ H
FRANK G. FONT
SUPERVISORY PATENT
EXAMINER